

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement was filed on September 17, 2003 and Applicants respectfully request that a copy of an initialed PTO-1449 form for this IDS be returned with the next office action. In addition, Applicants acknowledge receipt of a partially initialed PTO-1449 form for the IDS filed on September 8, 2004 (copy enclosed). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial the "European Search Report" in the "Other Documents" section of the partially initialed PTO-1449 form and return the completely initialed form with the next office action.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, page 9 of the specification has been amended to add the reference character "S4". Based on this amendment, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as allegedly being "anticipated" by Mori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,358). While not acquiescing in this rejection or in the characterizations of Mori et al., claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 have been amended and claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The discussion below makes reference to the amended claims.

Claim 1 is directed to an image display device comprising "shrunken image displaying means for displaying a list comprising said shrunken image created by said three-dimensional shrunken image creating means and said shrunken image created by said two-dimensional shrunken image creating means on a same screen of said display portion." As shown in Figure 4 of the subject application in connection with a non-limiting, example embodiment, both a shrunken image created by a three-dimensional shrunken image creating means and a shrunken image created by a two-dimensional shrunken image creating means can be viewed at the same time. "Identification information indicative of which of said three-dimensional image data and

said two-dimensional image data was used to create the shrunken image" can be provided (claim 8) so that a user can recognize whether the shrunken image was created by the two- or three-dimensional shrunken image creating means.

In contrast, in Mori et al. thumbnail image 950 of the panoramic image and thumbnail image 960 of the stereoscopic image are displayed in different screens as shown in Figure 20. Because thumbnail image 950 of the panoramic image and thumbnail image 960 of the stereoscopic image are displayed on different screens, these thumbnails of Mori et al. are clearly not displayed on a same screen of the display portion as specified in claim 1. Consequently, operation of Mori et al. is disadvantageous because an operation for switching screens is needed for viewing thumbnails 950 or 960. Because Mori et al. does not disclose the shrunken image displaying means of claim 1, Mori et al. cannot anticipate claim 1 or its dependent claims 2 and 5-9. *See, e.g., Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.")

Claim 10 is directed to an image display method comprising "a shrunken image displaying step of displaying a list comprising said shrunken image created in said three-dimensional shrunken image creating step and said shrunken image created in said two dimensional shrunken image creating step on a same screen." As explained above in connection with claim 1, in Mori et al., thumbnail image 950 of the panoramic image and thumbnail image 960 of the stereoscopic image are displayed on different screens. Consequently, Mori et al. does not disclose the claimed shrunken image displaying step in which a shrunken image created in a three-dimensional shrunken image creating step and a shrunken image created in a two dimensional shrunken image creating step are displayed on a same screen. As such, Mori et al. does not anticipate claim 10.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Mori et al. in view of Takiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,868,192). Takiguchi et al. is applied in the office action for its description of cropping a section of target image. *See* 5/17/05 Office Action, page 7. Takiguchi does not remedy the deficiencies of Mori et al. with respect to claim 1, from which claim 3 depends. As such, even assuming for the sake of argument that Mori et al.

were forcedly combined with Takiguchi et al., the subject matter of claim 3 would not have resulted.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Mori et al. in view of the IEEE dictionary. However, even assuming the image data of Mori et al. is considered to be "bitmap data", the subject matter of claim 4 would not result because of the above-noted deficiencies of Mori et al., which deficiencies are not remedied by the IEEE dictionary.

New claims 11-23 have been added. The subject matter of these new claims is fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter is added.

Independent claim 11 is directed to an image display device in which a display of thumbnail images comprises "a mixed display in which thumbnail images for both two-dimensional images and three-dimensional images are displayed at the same time." The applied documents do not disclose or suggest such a display and thus claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-23 are believed to be allowable over these documents.

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michael J. Shea

Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100